'931 Ko

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

THE CHRIST OF MODERN STUDY

Submitted by

Harold Christian Koch

(A.B., Dickinson, 1929)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1931

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

S21.

p6921

upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M.1931
ho

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/thechristofmoder00koch

O U T L I N E
(Table of Contents)

Page

INTRODUCTION
A. A delineation of the problem.....1
B. The worth of such a study.....2
C. The basis of selection of biographies.....2
D. Appraisal of the scope of this study.....4

Chapter I.
A REVIEW OF THE TEXTS.....5
A. Jesus The Son of God, by Bacon.....5
B. Jesus of Nazareth, by Barton.....5
C. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus, by Berguer....6
D. The Life and Teachings of Jesus, by Bosworth.....7
E. Jesus, by Bousset.....7
F. The Master, by Bowie.....8
G. Our Recovery of Jesus, by Bundy.....9
H. Jesus, A New Biography, by Case.....9
I. The Historicity of Jesus, by Case.....10
J. The Manhood of the Master, by Fosdick.....10
K. The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ, by Headlam.....11
L. The Life of Jesus, by Holtzmann.....12
M. The Life and Teachings of Jesus, by Kent.....12
N. Jesus of Nazareth, by Klausner.....13
O. The Son of Man, by Ludwig.....14
P. St. Mark's Life of Christ, by Robinson.....14
Q. The Gospel and its Tributaries, by Scott.....15
R. The Historical Life of Christ, by Warschauer....15
S. Was Jesus an Historical Person.....16

Chapter II.
THE HISTORICITY OF JESUS.....18
A. Types of Negative Criticism.....18
1. Jesus a pre-christian cult-god.....18
2. The Resemblance Theory.....18
3. The Pauline letters are spurious.....20
B. Positive Criticism.....21
1. The Pauline Evidence.....21
2. The Gospel Evidence.....23
3. Extra-biblical Evidence.....25

Chapter III.
THE CHARACTER OF JESUS.....27
A. Elements of Jesus' Character.....27
1. Jesus' Courage.....28
2. Jesus' Love and Compassion.....29
3. Jesus' Moral Character.....31
B. The Source of these supreme characteristics...33
1. Jesus' Prayer-Life.....33

Page

Chapter IV.
THE HUMANITY OF JESUS.....36
A. Jesus' human birth.....36
B. Jesus' normal growth.....38
C. Jesus' normal manhood.....38
D. Jesus not an ordinary man.....40

Chapter V.
JESUS AND MIRACLES.....42
A. Jesus and the miraculous birth.....42
B. Jesus and the temptation experience.....42
C. The Miracles Jesus performed.....44
D. Jesus and the miraculous resurrection.....47

Chapter VI.
THE RELATION OF JESUS TO HIS AGE.....49
A. Jesus the product of his age.....49
B. Jesus man of all ages.....51

Chapter VII.
THE RELATION OF JESUS TO JUDAISM.....54
A. Jesus confined by Judaism.....54
B. Jesus free from the confines of Judaism.....55

Chapter VIII.
THE MISSION OF JESUS.....56
A. The Matter of terms.....59
B. The Cause for perplexity.....60
C. Jesus as prophet.....61
D. Jesus as Messiah.....65
1.The eschatological type of Messiah.....65
2.The Saviour type of Messiah.....68

Chapter IX.
SUMMARY..... 72

(The Consecration of the Common Way).....74

Finis.....74

Bibliography.....75

Table of Contents.....i

THE CHRIST OF MODERN STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Delineation of the problem.

This study is for the purpose of finding the tendencies of the more recent biographies of Jesus Christ. By 'more recent' is meant those written since the beginning of the twentieth century. From the works included in this category have been selected those of a more serious nature regardless of the author's point of view. A close study of a representative number of these has been made with the object of learning in what direction the opinions about this character are turning.

This study is not in any sense a criticism of the books upon which it is based, unless it be by inference. It is of no particular concern here why or how the various writers came to their conclusions about the matter. The different authors may use the same incidents to arrive at different conclusions or they may reach the same conclusions by means of different incidents or processes of reasoning. It is only the conclusions that are of interest here.

Nor is it the purpose here to set forth a life of Christ, particularly in the sense that it pictures the true life of Christ, for in this study, which seeks to learn the tendency in presenting the various features and considerations connected with the person of Jesus, it is quite impossible to present a completely unified character.

Although we shall find that certain pretty well definded tendencies are in evidence among the serious modern biographers of Jesus, it must not be supposed that the conclusions that we shall reach will adequately state the position of all (or of any single one) of the authors under consideration.

It ought to be kept in mind that the presentation in this study of the conclusions of the several authors does not imply that their particular theories or kinds of approach are set forth as ideal or correct.

The worth of such a study.

Such a study has definite value to all those interested in this character. It would be meaningless to attempt to make such a study of all the biographies of Jesus that have been written, for they have been written under the varying environments of different ages. In this modern age, and particularly in the twentieth century, great discoveries and advances have been made in every line of study, so that we have need for a generalization and approximation of the biographies of Jesus which have been written since this age of greater knowledge has come. Thus we can contrast the results of the newer efforts with the older, and it may be that we can improve the older works by adding to their superior spiritual values the practical values of modern achievements of knowledge.

The basis of selection of biographies.

As stated above, the purpose of this paper is to deal with those lives of Jesus

which have had the advantage of the recent historical and psychological discoveries, as well as equally important advances in textual and other technical fields of investigation. In order to apply this criterion the books were all chosen from those written since the beginning of the century. The only other requirement necessary for a book to be used was that it should be a serious effort at presenting the life of Christ in the light of conclusions resulting from earnest study. The number of books selected for this study has been limited to a representative group adequate to show the tendencies of writers of this type.

In order to avoid the mistake of getting too much of one point of view, a definite effort has been made to select authors representing different fields of study. Thus we find among our chosen books some written by authors interested in the historical, psychological, psycho-analytic, or some other point of view. One book represents the Rabbinical point of view of Jesus and another is the view presented in a character study.

It will be noticed that sixteen of the nineteen books under consideration are biographical or similar in character, while there are three others decidedly not of that kind. These other books have been included for the purpose of obtaining direct material dealing specifically with the historicity of Jesus. Despite the

seeming obviousness of such a consideration, it is felt necessary to treat that phase of the problem in such a study as this so as to establish validity for the whole.

Appraisal of the scope of this study. Despite the fact that this effort is limited to works published since nineteen hundred, it cannot hope to be decisive for all that has been presented in this field since that time. Many more books have been written dealing with particular phases of Jesus' life or written with a definite purpose in view. Such works have been avoided as far as possible and the works here considered represent as nearly as possible the fair-minded class of writers interested in presenting Jesus in the light of the achievements of learning in their respective fields. Only with this group in mind does this study estimate the tendencies of the day in presenting the life of Jesus.

CHAPTER I.

A REVIEW OF THE TEXTS.

The various positions of the different authors with regard to particular features of Jesus' life will be revealed as the results of the study are set forth in the following pages, but in order that the reader may more easily hold in mind a clear and collected conception of each author's general position a brief review of each text studied is set down at this time.

Jesus The Son of God.[1]

This work is a series of four lectures on the character, life, and teachings of Jesus. Bacon finds Jesus to be a man who from his early youth bent his mind toward the things which concerned the Kingdom of God. Nothing is discovered in the life of Jesus which bespeaks the visionary and ecstatic, and the supernatural is completely rejected as having any part with him. Jesus is presented in this work as being a prophet and greater than a prophet for He is the Christ of God. His (Jesus') central idea (liberation for humanity through the reconciliation with the common Father) was universal. Jesus is found to be a man of deep inward experience, perfect character, and supreme achievement. The eschatological element is given little recognition.

Jesus of Nazareth.[2]

This life of Jesus was written for the young student

1. Bacon, Benjamin, Wisner.
2. Barton, George, A.

mind and is not extremely critical in its approach. Jesus is presented as being continually conscious of being the Messiah of the Old Testament prophecies, but not the Messiah of popular expectation. He is human and is a religious genius, but the presentation seems to lend him more than human quality. It is a picture of Jesus who is God incarnate. Jesus is not merely the product of his age and heritage, although these factors undoubtedly have influenced him. The supernatural is avoided in every possible connection yet he finds in Jesus powers and characteristics not quite commensurate with present day conceptions of the natural. We find here predominantly the prophet and Messiah.

Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.[1]

The life of Jesus is here presented through a study of a number of the more important experiences and phases of Jesus' earthly existence. It is presented from the psychological and psycho-analytic point of view. He emphasises the historicity of Jesus more than most biographical texts. Here is found a man, who because of his supreme personality, lived the life of the prophesied Messiah, casting off all of the lower traits of the figure and realising only its sublimity. Jesus reveals to men by his life a completely sublimated life to the divine. Nothing of the supernatural is accepted, but the miracles are accepted on psychological grounds. Jesus is conscious of a special mission and is endowed with

1. Berguer, Georges.

a creative personality. He was the Messiah according to his own interpretation of the figure.

The Life and Teachings of Jesus.[1]

Here we have a book written with the intention of presenting the life of Jesus in terms of a real religious experience. Bosworth finds the profound religious experience of Jesus to be the basis of his supreme personality. He finds Jesus to be a teacher and a prophet rather than a healer, and one who is strongly influenced by the eschatology of his people. He grants Jesus' Messiahship but finds this consciousness to be the result of development. Jesus' thinking and consciousness are confined to his own Age in the historical sense, but he is nevertheless the universal Redeemer of men for all Ages. Here also Jesus is presented as being non-miraculous in the supernatural interpretation of that term.

Jesus.[2]

The method of this author includes inferential conclusions gained through reasoning processes and from evident implications of the sources as a means of determining the life of Jesus. This life he finds to be human in origin and nature but supremely endowed and early possessed with a consciousness of his Messianic mission. He was or became, the Messiah because he could not present his cause otherwise. However he conceals

1. Bosworth, Edward, Increase.
2. Bousset, Wilhelm.

this consciousness until near his death. We find here revealed a Jesus who knows about, and is quite sympathetic to the fullest extent with the eschatology of his people. The kingdom that Jesus preached he expected to come as a climactic and supernatural event at the instance of God himself. His own acts were not supernatural, however, nor were his birth and resurrection physically supernatural. He was predominantly a teacher and healer and excelled in both these fields as no one else had done. His type is prophetic in a transcendent sense.

The Master.[1]

One finds here an author presenting the human Jesus, but not one of ordinary humanity. We find a genius who develops a Messianic consciousness according to his own interpretation. He transcends his own Age and race, and works thorugh its needs and deficiencies to a supreme conception of the will of God, which he portrays in terms of the Kingdom. There is nothing of the supernatural in this man although there is much about him beyond the comprehension of ordinary men. One of the outstanding features of this picture of Jesus is the evidence given for his colossal faith. Having grasped the plan of the Father, Jesus throws himself wholly upon it and unreservedly applies himself to executing it. "He was a soul that dared embody God."[2]

1. Bowie, Walter, Russel.
2. Ibid., pg.322

Our Recovery of Jesus.[1]

This purports to be an historical study of Jesus, and presents him emphatically as an historical figure; a layman, who believed himself to be called of God to do a special work. However Bundy finds Jesus to be a religious genius, the unique characteristic of his genius being that he was possessed of an exclusively religious personality. He is predominantly interested in presenting Jesus as he was, in the belief that this consideration will mean most to us. He finds Jesus a Jew in his religious faith, resourceful of intellect, of great enthusiasm, strong emotion , and a powerful will, capable of intense consecration and devotion; of certain attitudes, ambitions, and aspirations. Jesus is here presented as a prophet within the social order. The study is based on the Gospel material, with the greater emphasis on the Synoptic Gospels.

Jesus, A New Biography.[2]

The social point of view is the basis of this book and the presentation is of an earthly Jesus. Case finds Jesus to be entirely the product of his Age and adopts this fact as a criterion by which to judge everything that is to be applied to Jesus. If the matter under consideration does not fit Jesus' environment, then it does not fit Jesus. He finds Jesus to be a prophet, strictly human, and Jewish thorughout. Case classes Jesus as a religious reformer, only differing from other

1. Bundy, Walter, E.
2. Case, Shirley, Jackson.

religious reformers of the day in his method of proceedure and ultimate goal, but he finds here no trace of genius. Case grants Jesus a self-consciousness of a special task as prophet of God, but confines him to the eschatological views of his people. His ministry is carried out in view of this new Kingdom to come. The supernatural is absent in Jesus himself, but he believes in the power of God to perform supernatural acts in behalf of the people of the Jewish nation.

The Historicity of Jesus.[1]

The title of this book tells its essential nature, and it has been selected with this purpose in mind only. No inferences with regard to other features of Jesus have been made from its study. The thesis throughout the book is that Jesus was an historical person. The main arguments of the opposers of this view are examined and judged as insufficient and unclear. His proof is based upon the Pauline evidence, the evidence of the Gospels, the existence of the church, and witness of the apocryphal gospels, the Apostolic Fathers, Tacitus, and Josephus.

The Manhood of the Master.[2]

Although this book is not a biographical study it serves us the same purpose in revealing Fosdick's conclusions as to Jesus. It is a character study of Jesus based along a dozen characteristics, but in presenting these Fosdick sets down very definite ideas regarding

1. Case, Shirley, Jackson.
2. Fosdick, Harry, Emerson.

many phases of Jesus' life. He presents a human Jesus possessed of a consciousness of a unique relation to God, who thorughout life maintains a perfect union with God in thought, word, and deed. He allows this consciousness to be one of Messiahship in Jesus' understanding of the figure. He finds Jesus to be a religious revolutionist who was forced to the cross because he was loyal to his ideas which were contrary to those held by the religious authorities. He is subject to all of men's weaknesses but is possessed of endowments that enable him to conquer them and perfectly represent God. This Jesus is not in any way bound by his Age or race, but transcends them and is sufficient to guide men through all centuries, races, ages, and sexes. He has all of the supreme characteristics (human) that have been commonly associated with his name. His acts are not supernatural but his power with men and with things is extraordinary so as often to appear to be so.

The Life and Teaching of Jesus The Christ.[1]

Bishop Headlam interprets Jesus' life to be a natural one. Jesus had a normal youth and growth, and was subject to all that other men must experience. His teachings were the normal outcome of the circumstances in which he lived. He finds in Jesus a religious genius whose miracles are evidence for his spiritual authority. Jesus was humble prophet and Messiah but not the Messiah of the popular expectation. Neither was he an

1. Headlam, Arthur, C.

apocalyptic eschatologist. Headlam finds Jesus to reflect much of the thinking of his Age but does not confine him with its limitations. Jesus' words are profoundly original.

The Life of Jesus.[1]

The general tendency of this treatment is psychological. Jesus is entirely human, subject to making mistakes and feeling all the stresses of life. Here also we have the prophet and Messiah growing up out of the consciousness of a unique relation to God. He is found to be influenced quite strongly by Old Testament concepts and teachings, particularly in times of crisis, but he is not dependent upon them nor upon the Judaism of his day. The chief point of difference between Jesus and the current Judaism of his time, is in the placing of emphasis, rather than in any particular novelty in Jesus teaching or program. The supernatural is discredited and the unusual attainments of Jesus' personality and influence account for what seem to be miraculous accomplishments. Holtzmann presents a strong eschatological treatment of Jesus' life.

The Life and Teachings of Jesus.[2]

Here we find an attempt to present the viewpoints of the several Gospels as well as that of scholarship without any particular prejudice resulting from any one philosophy or point of view. He succeeds fairly well. Jesus to be He finds a natural, normal, and perfect man, with all

1. Holtzmann, Oscar.
2. Kent, Charles, Foster.

the glory and eternal quality that is his right. The miracles were not supernatural, but were of a divine, spiritual nature. Jesus is found to be preeminently a moral and religious teacher, but not in the technical sense of the terms. He is not an ethicist or a socialist. He was not in any sense the Jewish Messiah, but under that caption he was the Saviour of his people and of all people. There is in Jesus a resemblance to the prophets but he is far in advance of them in strength and insight. Jesus is a man of resourceful ability, potent personality, and is a religious genius. He is the eternal Jesus.

Jesus of Nazareth.[1]

The study of Jesus in this book is a means to an end rather than an end in itself, in that the author purposes to show wherein Judaism differs and remains distinct from Christianity. It is written by a Jerusalem Jew, and is valuable in that it gives us the results of the Rabbinical sources regarding Jesus. He finds Jesus to be strictly Jewish in every respect and is one who could have arisen from no other source. Jesus is called here an itinerant preacher of Galilee who later claimed to be the Jewish Messiah. He is strictly flesh and blood. Jesus' ministry is one of preparing for the Messianic claim, more than anything else. His Messianic hopes are bounded by the conception of the day and his fulfilment of them is largely a matter of imitation. The supernatural

1. Klausner, Joseph.

is out of the picture entirely. Jesus is self-reliant, and of exceptional ability, but cannot be God, Messiah, prophet, or law-giver, but merely moralist.

The Son of Man.[1]

The "Son of Man" is written for the popular reading public. It is most accurately classed as psychological. It must be remembered that this author is primarily a writer of biography and not a biblical student. He pictures a Jesus who is entirely human and emphasises the fact that he is a real person. His object is to portray the inner life of the prophet. The first period of this life is sunny and is spent in teaching. The latter part is filled with the Messianic consciousness and is overcast with all the shadows this created for him. Jesus is a genius, and is greater than all his contemporaries, but is unable to cope with the world into which he has been born. The miracles are not supernatural, but are psychologically valid, and are performed because of the prestige they gain for him, and because they are expected of the Messiah. This conception holds Jesus to be bound by his heritage and Age, and the result is a man of the earth, earthy.

St. Mark's Life of Christ.[2]

Here is an account of Jesus' life as witnessed in Mark's Gospel. It is primarily the presentation of Jesus the Messiah. This consciousness awakes at his Baptism,

1. Ludwig, Emil.
2. Robinson, Theodore, H.

and the purpose of his life is to teach the people to accept his conception of the Messianic fulfilment. Jesus' humanity is neglected and his superhuman qualities are stressed, so that when a miracle cannot be explained by modern scientific knowledge, Jesus is allowed to possess all the endowment of superhuman power necessary to authenticate the experience in question. Although Jesus draws heavily upon the Judaism of his heritage, he does not depend upon it and is presented in this work more as an originator. It is the kind of a Jesus, who after indication that people were looking upon him as the Messiah, deliberately sought to throw his life away, and in so seeking masterfully manipulated events and individuals to bring the desired result. Jesus lived in order to die.

The Gospel and its Tributaries.[1]

This book was written to show the sources of the Gospels but really reveals much about Jesus. However it is to be used here only for its historical evidence for Jesus' life. This h e insists upon, and makes Jesus the liberator of the matured conceptions of Hebrew thought. He finds Jesus' historicity vindicated in Christian thought, in an ineffaceable impression left behind him, in his prominence in the obscure lives of antiquity, and in the fact that Christianity is unexplainable without him. He is the basis of all later Christian thought and theology, which is empty without him. He also makes a

1. Scott, Ernest, Findlay.

strong appeal in looking to Jesus as the only valid explanation for the actions of Paul.

The Historical Life of Christ.[1]

The title suggests that this book is from the historical point of view and this is pursued in an intensely critical manner. Every detail of any significance in Jesus' life is closely examined by aid of the historical method and judged accordingly. The life of Jesus is maintained to be historical, and his every act is measured by the belief upon the part of Warschauer that Jesus holds definite Messianic hopes after the beliefs of his people, and that Jesus expects to play a very definite part in their great national expectation. This hope of his increases as his life and ministry progresses, and at the latter end he deliberately seeks death, almost in fear that he will not be put to death. Thus he does things deliberately intended to bring down upon himself the condemnation of the authorities. The eschatological treatment is aided by finding in Jesus a suggestion of more than human discernment of the course of events.

Was Jesus An Historical Person.[2]

This study deals only with the historicity of Jesus and has been selected for that very purpose. Prof. Worcester appeals to the affirmative testimony of Rabbi Wise as evidence for Jesus' actuality. He also

1. Warschauer, J.
2. Worcester, Elwood.

finds evidence for the historicity of Jesus in the Gospels, in St. Paul, in the church, and in what he calls "the creation of a new world out of nothing."[1] He finds the tri-lingual cross inscription to be proof of Jesus' execution as a condemned criminal of Rome, and thus witnessing Jesus' actuality. He appeals to the witness of Lehmann Haupt, Josephus, Tacitus, t he Talmud, Suetonis, and Pliny. Further evidence he locates in the spiritual character of Jesus' words.

1. Worcester, Elwood. Was Jesus An Historical Person. pg.10

CHAPTER II.

THE HISTORICITY OF JESUS.

Most of the biographers of Jesus have few or no direct statements with regard to his historicity for the simple reason that most of them take it for granted. They do not stop to question the matter. But the matter has been questioned, and because it has been questioned it is expedient to set down here a brief statement of the evidence for the fact of Jesus' existence as an historical person.

Types of negative criticism. Those who attempt to prove their denial of Jesus' historical life are not all of one school. They agree on one point only; viz, that Jesus never lived. One example of this type of criticism holds Jesus to have been concieved as a result of a similarly named Pre-Christian Cult God. Professor Case of Chicago examined the evidence for this claim and reached the following conclusion: "Jesus' name can be connected with these sects , which are alleged to have worshipped him as a cult-god, only by a precarious process of etymologizing, a method by which one may usually argue much and prove nothing."[1]..."The idea of a Pre-Christian Cult-God, as the starting point for the gospel religion, does not answer the requirements of the situation."[2]

Another kind of proof offered to discredit Jesus'

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson. The Historicity of Jesus.pg.123
2.Ibid.,129

historicity is that which attempts to say that Jesus is merely another myth similar to the hero of the Gilgamesh Epic. In reviewing this argument Professor Case says" "It is only by a generous omission of the main features of the narrative that a theory of 'resemblance' can be made even plausible."[1] "Large sections of both the Gospel history and the Babylonian epic have to be suppressed in order to establish even the faintest semblance of parallelism."[2] He concludes likewise with regard to similar resemblance arguments. "And as for resemblances between the Jesus of the Gospels and this alleged cult-god, Joshua, they do not touch the main features in the career of either personage."[3]

George A. Barton, speaking of these attempts to discredit Jesus, says:

"There is lastly a group of writers who endeavor to prove that Jesus never lived—that the story of his life is made up by mingling myths of heathen gods, Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, Greek, etc. No real scholar regards the work of these men seriously. They lack the most elementary knowledge of historical research....Their writings about the life of Jesus have no more claim to be regarded as historical than Alice in Wonderland or the adventures of Baron Munchausen."[4]

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.83
2. Ibid., pg.85
3. Ibid., pg.97
4. Barton,George ,A. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.x-xi

A third type of negative criticism is that which attacks Jesus' historicity by insisting that the Pauline letters which vindicate Jesus' existence are spurious. Having considered their argument, Prof. Case concludes: "In all fairness to the modern radical movement it may be said that its exponents have presented no thorough-going argument for the spuriousness of all the Pauline letters."[1] He furthur explains their method of attack. "Anything in these writings (Pauline) supposedly pointing to the historicity of Jesus is explained otherwise, or is called a later insertion."[2]

These are the main types of attack upon Jesus' historicity. By far the greater number of writers accept his historicity without question. Because such criticism is known to exist, Emil Ludwig states very early in his book on the life of Jesus that it is his aim "to convince those who regard the personality of Jesus as artificially constructed, that he is a real and intensely human figure."[3] Professor Case says in closing his examination of these arguments: "When all the evidence brought against Jesus' historicity is surveyed it is found to contain no elements of strength. The chief strength of the whole negative position is the intangibility of the data on which it rests."[4]

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.71
2. Ibid.,pg.72-73
3. The Son of Man. pg.xiv
4.Case, Shirley,Jackson. op.cit. pg.130

Positive Criticism.

Turning from attacks upon Jesus' historicity

Pauline Evidence.

let us look quickly at the arguments advanced in its support. Probably one of the most certain proofs of Jesus' actual existence is the Pauline evidence. Naturally this evidence depends upon the genuineness of the Pauline letters. There is no space here for the detailed proof necessary to adequately validate the Pauline letters, but witness can be cited in their support. Professor Case tells us that Clement of Rome supports the view that the principal Pauline epistles are valid, and also that scholars today generally accept them.[2] "The historicity of Paul and the genuineness of the principal Pauline letters are supported by the data of both external and internal testimony; and if, say, only the letter to the Galatians, or one of the Corinthian Epistles, is genuine, the existence of a historical Jesus would seem to be amply attested."[2]

In considering the Pauline evidence for Jesus' historicity, Georges Berguer states: "Nevertheless, he (Paul) says enough for us to be certain that we are dealing with someone (Jesus) who has really lived."[3] "The testimony of St. Paul would alone suffice to establish clearly the existence of the historic Christ."[4] Paul's references to Jesus seem to be noted

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.178
2. Ibid., pg.190
3.Berguer,Georges.Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.66
4. Ibid., pg.83

particularly as valuable proof of Jesus' historicity by Worcester in his study of this problem. He tells us that "Paul gloried in being a witness to Jesus Christ."[1] He gives credence also to "his (Paul's) plain allusions to the human facts of Jesus' life" as significant evidence of Jesus historicity.[2]

We are familiar with the fact that Paul was as antagonistic to the Christian Community as possible up to a certain point, whereupon he changed completely and became just as active in supporting this new sect. Professor Case explains this startling change.

> "Paul stood too near to the age which professed to know Jesus, to be sucessfully hoodwinked on the historical question. If Jesus never lived it is not at all probable that even the most enterprising propagandists could have succeeded in persuading Paul of the reality of this mythical person within the generation to which Paul himself belonged."[3]

In further proof for Paul's conviction of Jesus' reality and his witnessing for it, Case says: "...a good part of his attention is given to resisting opponents who claim superiority over him because they have been, or have recieved their commission from men who have been, personal companions of Jesus—a fact which Paul never denies,."[4]

1.Worcester,Elwood.Was Jesus an Historical Person.pg.42
2. Ibid.,pg.49
3.Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.197-198
4. Ibid.,pg.198

Thus he reaches the conclusion that "The historicity of Jesus is also a prerequisite to Paul's Christian life and work."[1]

This conception of Paul's support of Jesus' reality is strongly supported by Ernest Findlay Scott. He makes the following comment with regard to Paul's references to Jesus and to Christ: "He transfers to the glorified Messiah those qualities that have impressed him in the life and character of Jesus."[2] "Yet assuredly he (Paul) knew the life of Jesus. He had pondered over its meaning, as no other man has ever done, in the light of that one manifestation which included everything."[3] Thus "a redeeming power had manifested itself in Christ. Paul was conscious that it had transformed his own life, and he set himself to declare that it would do the same for all men."[4] But there is other evidence for the historicity of Jesus.

The Gospel Evidence. No one denies the fact that the Gospels do not present a complete account of Jesus' life. However they do bear ample witness to the validity of that life which cannot be discounted. It is evident here also that the testimony depends upon the genuineness of the Gospels themselves. These are claimed by some to be invalid. It is admitted that some parts of the Gospels are later additions and that

1. Case, Shirley, Jackson. The Historicity of Jesus. pg. 200
2. The Gospel and Its Tributaries. pg. 136
3. Ibid., pg. 137
4. Ibid., pg. 154

some parts are inherent errors of the authors, but in general they are staunchly defended. Scott tells us that "however we may regard various details of the narrative, there is no room for doubt that it reflects, with substantial truth, an historical Personality which had left a clear and ineffaceable impression."[1] "We need to begin with the indutiable facts—that Jesus inspired his followers with a boundless devotion, that he brought good tidings to the poor and distressed, that he worked for the Kingdom and was faithful unto death. These are the foundations of the history, and no criticism can shake them."[2] Bundy tells us about Jesus that "In the Synoptics... his message of God as Father is the crystallization of his own individual experience as an historical human person."[3] Case supports the Gospel testimony also. "The necessity of accepting in good faith the Gospel representation of Jesus' historicity is practically forced upon us by his proximity to the community in which his life-story first took place."[4] "His actual existence was uniformly accepted as a matter of course, which at that time is tantamount to denying the very possibility of doubt about his existence."[4] It should be mentioned in this connection that Case records Papias' authentication

1.Scott,Ernest,Findlay.The Gospel And its Tributaries.pg.50
2. Ibid.,pg.51
3. Bundy,Walter,E.Our Recovery of Jesus.pg.46
4.Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.229

of Mark's Gospel.[1] Probably the strongest support of the Gospel testimony is the teaching ascribed to Jesus. "..a fitting source for the thinking ascribed to him (Jesus) is nowhere found more appropriately than in an individual who occupied the place and confronted the problems assigned by tradition to him."[2] Ludwig quotes Rousseau as saying in this connection that "had he never lived the writers of the Gospels would have been as great as Jesus."[3]

Extra-Biblical Evidence. Numerous other arguments might be set forth at length but we must be content with naming a few which are classified as 'extra-biblical' evidence. The outstanding evidence is the very existence of the Christian community. "The Christ-idea alone is not equal to the task of producing Christianity, it is not sufficiently real, human, vital."[4] The disciples "had a distinct recollection of the earthly individual with whom they had associated,..."[5] Scott adds that "they had known him in his lifetime as a soverign personality."[6] "Jesus had impressed on his disciples that they were brethern, who owed love and service to one another. It was this spirit of charity, born of faith in Christ, which tried to embody itself in the organized church."[7]

There are a few more of these witnesses for Jesus.

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.209
2. Ibid.,pg.231
3. Ludwig,Emil. Son of Man.pg.xiv.
4. Case, Shirley,Jackson. op.cit.,pg.236
5. Ibid.,pg.175
6.Scott,Ernest,Findlay.TheGospel And Its Tributaries.pg.62
7. Ibid.,pg.89

Case holds that the apocryphal gospels attest Jesus' earthly existence as common belief,[1] and that the Apostolic Fathers take the reality of Jesus' earthly existence for granted.[2] Calling upon further witnesses he says: "Tacitus' information is much more explicit. According to his definite statement, the Christians whom Nero persecuted were named from 'Christ ' who had been put to death by Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius."[3] Case also considers the evidence of Josephus in his "Antiquities" but says that there is some doubt as to whether this evidence is authentic.[4] However Worcester holds these references to be genuine and refers the reader to the North Slavic manuscript.[5] In support of this conclusion by Worcester we have the verification of Joseph Klausner, an eminent Jerusalem Rabbi who holds that Josephus did mention Jesus as being an historic person.[6] We have Worcester's added statement that Tacitus, speaking of the Christians, said: "The founder of this name is Christ, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was put to death by the Procurator Pontius Pilate."(Annals xv.44)[7] He also claims that the Talmud, Suetonius, and Pliny affirm Christ as historical.[8] Numerous modern writers and witnesses are obtainable but they are all based on these sources and upon the Gospels.

1. Case,Shirley,Jackson.The Historicity of Jesus.pg.238
2. Ibid.,pg.239 3.Ibid.,pg.24 6 4.Ibid.,pg.250-251
5.Worcester,Elwood.Was Jesus an Historical Person.pg.15-17
6. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.42,59
7.Worcester,Elwood.op.cit.,pg.32 8.Ibid.,pg.37

CHAPTER III.

THE CHARACTER OF JESUS.

This is predominantly an age of examination. We seem to have developed a mania for applying searching tests to everything. Whatever fails to successfully meet our tests is discarded. We refuse to be fooled into accepting sham for reality. There are many good points about such an attitude, but frequently this principle becomes perverted and our examination becomes motivated by other ends. In the field of biography this has taken place to an alarming degree and the resultant proceedure has become largely one of 'muck raking.' We examine the character of the great lights of history and pull out into the open every bit of degrading evidence that we can find, and having done our worst, turn to the general public and say: "Behold the man!"

It is interesting to note that desipte the prominence that this practice has attained in our day, the extent to which it has been applied to the character of Jesus is almost negligible. This is interesting particularly because of the fact that Jesus has many foes who would gladly avail themselves of this weapon in order to defame him if they could wield it. But the character of Jesus has been unassailable, and though a few of these foes' deadliest missiles have been hurled at his perfect record, they have fallen aside like broken arrows. Thus it is that we find, almost without exception,

the character of Jesus is being pictured today in all the fineness and glory that ever has been associated with his name. It is true that many writers fall short of his glory because of their failure to apreciate all that he was and meant to be, but not because of any malicious desire to degrade him. Let us see with what kind of character they find him possessed.

Jesus' courage. We find Jesus presented predominantly as a man of exceptional courage. This is done in several ways. It is shown by some authors through inferences gained from the things they find him doing, and it revealed by others through a direct remark. Thus we find George A. Barton saying: "He was full of courage and zeal."[1] Bosworth shows this courage by citing Jesus' bold attack upon the doings and teachings of the Jerusalem Scribes.[2] Bowie portrays Jesus' supreme courage in various experiences but his supreme expression of it is his testimony when he says that Jesus was "a soul that dared embody God."[3] To anyone who has even feebly applied himself to living the will of God, the suggestion of the unspeakable courage required to exemplify faultlessly the perfect purity of God is overwhelming! Case sets it forth vividly when he explains that - "without either technical equipment or professional experience the relatively unknown artisan of Nazareth

1. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.129
2. The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg. 133f.
3. The Master. pg.322

undertook the task of religious leadership for all Israel."[1] The very fact that the religious authorities were the ones who chalenged his authority and opposed him at every turn shows the courgage he had in defying them so openly upon so many issues. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick reveals the source of Jesus' courage by saying: "Jesus' courageous patience with undesirable situations and with the necessity of suffering, sprang from His absolute trust in the good purpose of God."[2]

We do not find one case among these authors where a direct attempt is made to set Jesus forth as a craven, or as one who allowed the course of personal danger to cause him to deviate from his purpose. In fact , Oscar Holtzmann very emphatically denies it, for in treating Jesus' scene in Gethsemane he states: "There can, of courde,be no question of cowardice."[3] In his work on Jesus' life, Joseph Klausner hints that Jesus may have feared the Baptist's fate from Herod, but he does not establish the point or make anything of it.[4] But courage is only one phase of Jesus' character.

Jesus' love and compassion.

Another of the phases of Jesus' character that reveals his supreme quality is that summed up in the expressions 'tender love' and 'merciful compassion.' These seemed to dominate his personality so that he was governed by them in dealing

1. Case,Shirley, Jackson.Jesus,A New Biography.pg.213
2. The Manhood of the Master.pg .59
3. The Life of Jesus.pg.469
4. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.273

with his enemies as well as with his friends and patients. The degree to which this is presented in the various works differs to some extent, but none of them denies it of him. Barton speaks of this capacity in Jesus frequently but probably expresses it best in saying:"We know that Jesus cared for the poor."[1] To care for the poor to the extent of doing something about it in a world peopled with men striving to 'obtain', measures the character of any man. In this regard Oscar Holtzmann speaks of Jesus' "compassionate love,"[2] and again, of his qualities of "gentleness, sensibility, compassion, and patience."[3] He best illustrates this by interpreting Jesus' anguish in Gethsemane as being at least in part for Judas and the other disciples.[4] Along with these positive test imonies must be cited another discordant note from Joseph Klausner who tells us that Jesus was cruelly harsh to the woman of Syro-Phoenicia.[5] This position is questionable and moreover it does not disprove Jesus' compassion.Klausner does not seem to take into consideration the fact that Jesus was in that region for the purpose of retirement and his unwillingness to perform the cure was because such an act would make retirement impossible. This position is justified by the Gospel narrative which records such a result from his cure.

1. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.343
2. The Life of Jesus.pg.345
3. Ibid.,pg.303 (note 2)
4. Ibid.,pg.469
5. Jesus of Nazareth ..pg.294

Jesus' moral character.

Probably the least questioned phase of Jesus' character is its moral quality. None openly attacks him on this basis. There is some suggestion of an element of negative value here, but the note is not prominent enough anywhere to class it as a direct attack. We find for the most part an enthusiastic avowal of Jesus' supreme moral character. It is in this quality that they most frequently find the basis of his greatness. Thus Charles Foster Kent concludes: "The supreme miracle in the life of Jesus and in human history is his transcendent moral character and its effect upon men."[1] Theodore H. Robinson, while he does not openly stress Jesus' personal morality (nor does he attack it) speaks of "his sharp and emphatic moral vision,"[2] which rather implies a moral character behind it. The supreme quality of Jesus' moral character is forcefully put by Wilhelm Bousset when he says: "Jesus' soul,...,was filled only with the majesty of the moral law;"[3] and at another time writes in connection with Jesus' unimpeachable morality: "no impure atmosphere was capable of sullying his purity."[4] The suggestion with which Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick witnesses to Jesus' morality strikes the eye like a blazing headline: "measure, if you can, His hatred of a lie!"[5]

Such are the characteristic presentations of Jesus' character. There are some less complimentary suggestions

1.The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.102
2.St.Mark's Life of Christ. pg.47
3. Jesus.pg.136.
4. Ibid.,pg.161
5. The Manhood of the Master.pg.74

and these must be considered also. The chiefest of these are found in Emil Ludwig's " The Son of Man", and again in Joseph Klausner's "Jesus of Nazareth." The latter makes just an insinuation against Jesus' moral motives by telling us that Jesus purified the Temple only for the purpose of gaining recognition and a following among the people.[1] The situation does allow the possibility of such a motive for the people did resent the Temple practices. However, when we consider the other evidences for Jesus' moral character and couple them with the setting of the Temple incident, it is clearly apparent that the moral issue was the primary one and the motive which Klausner indicates could only have been a secondary one at best. For us to choose it as Jesus' purpose would be to break the very rules of historical criticism which Klausner uses to such good advantage elsewhere. The negative reflection made by Ludwig is similar. He accuses Jesus of performing miracles, not through mercy and compassion for the unfortunate, but because it was expected of him as Messiah and because he could gain prestige by so doing.[2] This is not so much a direct attack upon Jesus' moral character as it is a failure on the part of Ludwig to appreciate the difference between Jesus and the previous prophets. Besides, it is entirely inferential evidence since Jesus' thoughts and motives are unknown except as he expressed them and Jesus' never voiced such a motive.

1. Jesus of Nazareth. pg. 313
2. The Son of Man. pg. 122

It would be possible to make a long list of the many vital features of Jesus' character, but enough of the most important ones have been mentioned to show the tendency in presenting the matter. It only remains to see what the authors have to say about the source of these great quality-characteristics.

Jesus' prayer-life.

The experience of Jesus' life in which the authors find the primary basis for Jesus' wonderful achievement in character is his prayer life. They find him resorting to it naturally and constantly. Barton says with regard to the stress of the last few days: "Now in this greater crisis, with the cross so near, he instinctively sought relief and strength in prayer."[1] Speaking of a more general principle rather than of such a crisis, Walter E. Bundy makes this same discovery. "Jesus had his sources of spiritual stimulus, his sources of personal power that supported and sustained him, that controled his conduct and that directed his decisions at important junctures in his life. These were located in prayer and communion with God."[2] Bowie, too, is sure Jesus wrought many of his conclusions and decisions in prayer, so that he says quite confidently regarding Jesus' approach to Gethsemane: "Under the olive trees, in the quiet, Jesus had gone before to pray. He would go again tonight."[3] With this thought under treatment, Case

1. Jesus of Nazareth. pg. 358
2. Our Recovery of Jesus.297
3. The Master. pg.277-278

characterizes Jesus as "a soul that enjoyed perpetual communion with God its Father."[1] Similarly Oscar Holtzmann calls Jesus a man of prayer,[2] and explains his superior strength in meeting crises by this fact which he illustrates in the case of Gethsemane by stating that Jesus had "recourse to prayer to gain strength to meet this,...."[3](Gethsemane crisis and cross) Robinson finds it to be the source of his (Jesus') power. "The time He had alone was spent in prayer.... There is no reason to doubt—there is every reason to believe—that prayer was His normal habit , and that it was from this practice that He derived His strength....Prayer was His rest,..."[4] He also concieves it as a natural part of Jesus' life and expresses it much as Barton for he says of the Gethsemane experience: "..in this lack of true human fellowship Jesus turned as it were by instinct to prayer."[5] Probably the closest relation between Jesus' God-like character and his prayer life is expressed by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick when he explains that "Prayer was the spontaneous expression of His comunity of life with God."[6] Emil Ludwig records Jesus' prayers but makes no significant comment, but J. Warschauer, who is extremely critical, testifies nevertheless, that "He

1. Case,Shirley,Jackson. Jesus,A New Biography.pg.386
2. The Life of Jesus. pg.289
3. Ib id.,pg.468
4. St.Mark's Life of Christ.pg.31
5. Ibid.,pg.121
6. The Manhood of the Master.pg.141

needed to calm and fortify his soul in prayer, in communion with His Father;"[1] thus recognizing that Jesus' source of strength was primarily his vital relation with God through the medium of prayer.

It seems clearly to be evident that despite the various theories about Jesus' position in the life of his day and in that of the centuries to follow, no clear attempt to separate him from his prayer life has been made. The answer to this is plainly evident. Without his complete self- resignation in vital communion with the supreme author of the universe we cannot find an adequate explanation for this transcendent character. Jesus did not live unto himself, but so completely yielded his own personality to that of God that his perfect character mirrors the majesty and mercy of the Father. The value of this revelation for men is that he not only revealed the nature of God and his will for men, but that through his example we are able to find the way by which we may likewise come into close fellowship with the Father. It is this that makes Jesus our Saviour.

1.Warschauer, J. The Historical Life of Christ.pg.309

CHAPTER IV.

THE HUMANITY OF JESUS.

The question of Jesus' humanity involves, among other things, the question of his birth. Had he been miraculously born he might have been considered as hist—orical, but he could not under such conditions be judged truly human. To be human involves not only human behaviour and temper, but also human origin. It is a matter of species also. It is not within the limits of this study to set forth a discussion of the many features involved in the virgin birth controversy but it is the object of this study to present the conclusions of these select—ed authors in the matter.

Jesus' human birth.

The g—eneral tendency among the authors studied is to present a Jesus who was naturally born to actual human life. There is a difference in the stress laid upon this fact , and the motives for which the various views are held also varies, (some do not mention it at all) while others take Jesus' human birth for granted. Some leave it in the balance for the reader to decide for himself. This is the testimony of Berguer: "There is a difference in nature between him and ourselves, but not a fundamental difference. He is himself man; his experience is the true human experience."[1] This is not open comment on Jesus' birth and must not be taken as such but he plainly implies that he regards Jesus as a regu—lar human being, and it is fair to suppose he impl—ies

1. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.25 5

a human birth. However some others are more positive in their conclusions. Oscar Holtzmann appeals to the Scriptures and concludes: "Throughout Jesus' public life there is never any mention of his birth having been attended by a miracle."[1] Hence he states, after also accounting for Mark's treatment of the story, that: "Jesus then, was born at Nazareth in Galilee, the son of Joseph and Mary,..."[2] C.F.Kent is non-committal upon the matter but plainly implies that a miraculous birth would add nothing to Jesus' status. "To Jesus the question of human descent was certainly unimportant compared with that of doing the will of his Heavenly Father."[3] Bousset dismisses the idea with the remark that the virgin-birth story "betrays itself by its very content to be a piece of dogmatic legend."[4] He strengthens this conclusion by appealing to the Syriac translation which says: "Joseph, to whom Mary the virgin was betrothed, begot Jesus, who is called Messiah."[5] Berguer also rejects the idea.[6] This conclusion he bases on Mary's later attitude toward his sanity. The two conceptions are not commensurate. Warschauer examines the whole tradition and finds it impossible of sustaining itself.[7] Clearly the tendency is to discount the story in favor of Jesus' true humanity.

1. The Life of Christ. pg.84
2. Ibid.,pg.89
3. The Life and Teachings of Jesus. pg.263
4. Jesus.pg.3
5. Ibid.pg.4
6. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.102-103
7. The Historical Life of Christ.pg.11-31

Jesus' normal growth.

Jesus' humanity is further attested in these studies by references to his normal human growth. Warschauer makes this very plain in his statement that Jesus as a boy passed "through all the normal stages of development, a natural, healthy, well balanced youth;"[1]. Barton appeals to the Scriptures and reminds us that "the Gospels imply that Christ had a real human development, and ' grew in wisdom' as well as 'in stature,'..."[2] He supplements this with the following statement: "We tread on the safe ground of historical fact when we regard his boyhood as a real boyhood, his humanity as a real humanity, and also trust his consciousness that he was t he Son of God."[3] In speaking of his childhood days Berguer comes to the conclusion that "it is quite useless, in any case, to imagine him as different from the others."[4] (his sisters,brothers, and playmates.)

Jesus' normal manhood.

Probably one of the most convincing arguments for Jesus' humanity lies in the fact that in his life up until the very last he behaved like any normal human, except that he achieved transcendent heights of perfection. He succeeded where other men failed. The tendency is common among these authors to base their conclusions of Jesus' humanity upon this very fact, namely that h e acted like a human being acts.

1. The Historical Life of Christ.pg. 30
2. Barton,George,A.Jesus of Nazareth.pg.x
3. Ibid.,pg.87
4. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.131

We find this to be the case with Georges Berguer, who says: "He(God) did not make him known by means of miracles; on the contrary, Jesus had to win through human labour and human suffering his credentials to humanity."[1] Robinson presents this fact about Jesus through an appeal to logic and says:"There is a suspicion that the Incarnation itself would be incomplete unless the Incarnate God took on him the full intellectual limitations of humanity, that Jesus, though his spiritual and ethical outlook was in full harmony--indeed was identical with the best that human intelligence ever could hold, still thought of many things in the same terms as those who were round about him."[2] Charles Foster Kent reasons in a similar strain when he says of the temptation experience: "It reveals the one absolutely normal and therefore perfect man."[3] This shows the way in which Jesus was normal and still transcendent of other men. Jesus was completely normal, therefore perfect, while most other men were merely average normal. In comparing Jesus with the prophets who are accepted by all as being strictly human, Wilhelm Bousset says:"In contrast with them (O.T.prophets) how homely, how true to human life, is the figure of Jesus."[4] Later he declares of Jesus that he never overstepped the limits of the purely human!"[5]

Case explains the difference in Jesus' triumphs as compared

1. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.217
2. St. Mark's Life of Christ.pg.87
3. The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.69
4. Jesus.pg.27
5. Ibid.,pg.202

with other humans thus: "He shared their feelings of storm and stress and rose to greater heights of assurance only as he answered more unreservedly the summons of God to greater loyalty in personal religious living."[1] When Jesus would have the rich young man as a disciple and was not able to persuade him, Oscar Holtzmann attributes to him the human feeling of despondency over inability to achieve his desire. "Jesus' saying is indicative of a certain degree of despondency; he is depressed by his want of success."[2] He says further in an explanatory note regarding the same incident: "At the same time, Jesus now marks himself as entirely on a level with men; he could not save the rich man when he would so gladly have done so."(note 2) Thus we see the clear tendency to present Jesus as a human and perfectly normal individual. One point alone remains to be made clear.

Jesus not an ordinary man.

To ascribe normality to a man does not infer that he is ordinary. None of these authors regards Jesus as ordinary,regardless of the opinion they may have concerning his place among men. Bowie makes the explanation very clearly. "It would seem that every student of the life of Jesus would realize that he himself would not be at pains to be studying that life after nineteen hundred years if Jesus had been ordinary."[3] Bousset also asserts this fact.[4] Others take

1. Jesus,A New Biography. pg.361
2. The Life of Jesus.pg.379
3. The Master. pg.116
4. Jesus.pg.29

it for granted, and say nothing about it. Jesus' difference from other men lay in the fact that he was completly normal and therefore transcendently perfect. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick reveals a truth in this regard that explains why Jesus was not ordinary. "This impression of perfection which the Master made is entirely unique in the spiritual history of man. No one ever made it before or since, and no one ever tried to claim it."[1] And in explanation of his accomplishment he says: "His perfection in character does not come from inability to sin, but from ability to conquer."[2] That is the secret of the human Jesus.

1. The Manhood of the Master.pg.34
2. Ibid.,pg.88

CHAPTER V.

JESUS AND MIRACLES.

During the greater part of the Christian Era, the belief has been dominant that the life of Jesus was very intimately connected with miraculous events from the time of his conception until his ascension. These events have been held to imply great significance for Jesus and proof for his Godly-nature has been grounded in these miraculous events. Because of the fact that considerable of the more advanced knowledge of this modern era has implications with regard to these miraculous events, it is considered important to examine the works of this study to ascertain what position is being taken today in this regard. It is not necessary to examine all of the events concerned, but an examination of the position taken by these authors upon certain prominent events will reveal the tendency of the age in this connection.

Jesus and the miraculous birth.

The tendency of these modern writers with regard to Jesus' miraculous birth has already been presented,[1] so that it is not necessary to re-examine this feature. Suffice it to say that the tendency is not in favor of an unnatural origin for Jesus. But there are other features of Jesus' activity that will bear examination of this kind.

Jesus and the temptation experience.

The temptation experiences of Jesus have in the past been considered as actual miraculous experiences wherein Jesus spoke with Satan in

1.cf.above, Ch.IV.pg 36-37

person, took an airy flight to the pinnacle of the Temple and back again, and viewed the lands of the world from a mountain top. There has been a decided change here and the tendency today is to present them as vivid pictures of an inward struggle in the mind of the solitary Jesus as he ponders over his problems in the wilderness. Thus Walter Russel Bowie explains: The "record of the temptation is cast in a highly symbolic form..The elements of Jesus' inner experience are projected like figures in a drama."[1] He goes further to explain the reasoning by which he arrives at this conclusion:

> "It was not the way of Jesus to want to work marvels over nature; rather he worked miracles in men. In the last temptation in the wilderness he had faced and reconciled that instinctive, but crude, human desire which the old book of Job had left unsatisfied. Give us a God who intervenes according to our prescription and we will believe in God, men said then, and have said since. Let the outer world be obedient to our physical need. But Jesus had another answer. He had it in the wilderness and he kept it thorugh the days to follow. Let the facts without call out the utmost from your life within. Then neither life nor death can hurt you, for you are linked with the undying purposes of God."[2]

1. The Master. pg.83
2. Ibid.,pg.139

George A. Barton takes the same point of view in regard to the nature of the temptations; ie.not accepting them as miraculous events but as an inner struggle.[1] Georges Berguer says: The temptation was entirely a private experience, "not a historical fact but a psychic fact,"..[2] "The devil who departs is the inner resistance which yeilds to the pressure of the élan vital; the angels are the deep energies which came to the rescue, the forces of sublimation on the wings of which life rises to meet the tasks it must undertake."[3] Warschauer characterizes the temptation narratives as a "poetic presentation of a spiritual experience."[4] Joseph Klausner characterizes these stories taken as a group as a "wonder story" and presents them in reality as a meditation upon the part of Jesus over the three current conceptions of the Messianic method.[5] Thus we see clearly that the various types of scholars tend to present this experience as non-miraculous.

The Miracles Jesus performed.

Another phase of Jesus' activity which has been connected closely with the supernatural is the healing and feats of wonder that he is credited with performing. In the past, great importance has been placed upon the significance of these events,

1. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.123-125
2. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus. pg. 162
3. Ibid.,pg.178
4. The Historical Life of Christ. pg.57
5. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.253

but the tendency today is to acknowledge certain aspects of them as valid but to give them no especial importance apart from their setting. The attitude taken towards them varies and the explanations as to how they took place are different, but on the whole the tendency is to discount any supernatural feature and present them as results of personal psychic power aided by the faith of both the healer and the healed. The nature miracles are explained (when at all considered) by reinterpreting the story and finding imperfections or misunderstanding upon the part of the narrator. Thus we find Bousset saying: "His method of healing may be called a psychical one; he stirred the forces of the inner life so powerfully that they reacted upon the outward bodily life."[1] "They were psychologically concievable, and this feature of the life of Jesus has nothing absolutely unique about it."[2] "Where Jesus found no faith, he could effect no cures."[3] With regard to the unexplainable events, he states: "There are in fact but a very few stories which record an absolutely miraculous and impossible event, or for which no analogy can be found. These few must then be cast aside as the mere outgrowths of legend."[4] George A. Barton says: "There is no doubt but that our Lord possessed in supreme measure what is in modern times called 'psychic' power."[5] He regards all of the so called

1. Jesus, pg.47
2. Ibid., pg.48
3. Ibid., pg.49
4. Ibid., pg.54
5. Jesus of Nazareth, pg.211

miracles of raising the dead as simply Jesus' awakening them from a comatose state. This is illustrated in his treatmeant of the Lazarus story.[1] Bowie tells us that "the mighty acts which Jesus did, and of which he spoke, were no prodigies....He thought of them as that mighty naturalness with which the Spirit of God must operate through lives which were open to recieve it."[2] It ought to be stated here that Bowie's treatment of the miracles is exceptionally masterful. Having taken time to state his position carefully, he refuses to push himself to extremes in order to account for the detailed narratives of the varous events under consideration. He treats them for their intrinsic value or moves on to the next matter. Berguer adopts the position that it is "a mistake to consider them as violations of the natural order." "Jesus did things without the experimental science of the modern psycho-analysts, but there is no need to suppose that he did them in any different fashion."[3] Theodore H. Robinson has a slight tendency to credit a superhuman element in Jesus. He calls much of Jesus' healing suggestion, and suggests that his unexplainable personality allows him the possibility of performing the nature miracles (which he accepts as valid) even though they appear to violate the natural order.[4] Kent, on the other hand, agrees with the authors

1. Barton,George,A. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.266
2. The Master. pg.196
3. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus. pg.201,207
4. St. Mark's Life of Christ. pg.131-133

who find them to be 'law abiding' events in their historical cores.[1] Naturally the stories grew with age. Joseph Klausner also finds nothing of the supernatural in these deeds.[2] Thus we feel quite safe in concluding that the modern tendency is to present a Jesus who did no supernatural acts, but who possessed a personality strong enough to influence men's lives and minds and bodies tremendously for good, both physically and spiritually.

Jesus and the miraculous resurrection.

Probably the other experience of Jesus' life with which the supernatural interpretation has been associated largely is the resurrection experience. Today the tendency is to avoid the supernatural implications of this event. The result is uncertain. Few are definitely committed upon the actual happening, but all agree that the early Christians were convinced that Jesus had conquered the grave. Even Klausner does not attempt to deny this fact. However none of these works attempts to defend a physical resurrection. Some venture to give an explanation of what took place. Klausner gives his testimony to the fact that a deliberate imposture in the matter is impossible, since millions have founded their faith on it. He believes Jesus was reburied in an unknown grave by Joseph of Aramathea.[3] This is the most popular explanation when one is offered. Robinson makes no

1. The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.108
2. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.268-270
3. Ibid.,pg.357

attempt to explain it in detail but concludes: "Jesus was not there, and instead of the dead body they (the women) found the assurance that He was not dead but alive."[1] Charles Foster Kent says: "The exact form of these revelations is not so essential as the effects traceable throughout the entire history of the primitive church."[2] His treatment finds the naturalistic interpretation to be only temporary explanation and inadequate; the supernatural explanation as plainly unsatisfactory, and the spiritual explanation as the most probable.[3] Bowie says "what happened to the body laid in Joseph's grave is something never to be fully explained."[4] However his interpretation here given is a spiritual one. George A. Barton is convinced of the resurrection but is in doubt as to its nature. The disciples are convinced they are sure of Jesus' freedom from the grave.[5] Holtzmann denies the possibility of the disciples having stolen the body, and favors Joseph moving the corpse to another resting place, and inists the facts are against a physical resurrection and its assumptions.[6] Such is the trend in treating this matter. It is miraculous indeed, but these authors fail to find in it a physical miracle of any kind.

1. St. Mark's Life of Christ. pg.129
2. Life and Teachings of Jesus. pg.309
4. The Master.pg.315 cf.310-311
3. Kent,Charles,Foster. op.cit.,pg.306-309
5. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.390-391
6. Jesus. pg.498-500

CHAPTER VI.

THE RELATION OF JESUS TO HIS AGE.

Considerable place is given today to the idea that Jesus was closely related to his age. The extent to which this is carried depends upon the author, there being considerable differences of opinion, but all agree that to understand Jesus we must see him as one living in his age and using the terms of his day. Regardless of how timeless and eternal Jesus may be, he was certainly greatly influenced by the environment of his land and age and in some degree he is unexplainable apart from it. Some writers hold to the view that Jesus was entirely the product of, and completely encompassed by his own age. Others take the opposite viewpoint.

Jesus the product of his age.

Some scholars hold to the point of view that Jesus was entirely the product of his age and nothing more. Probably the outstanding exponent of this view is Professor Case of Chicago. He traces every teaching of Jesus to the soil of his age and he arrives at the conclusion that nothing He says or does can have a meaning other than would be comprehensible by the attainments of the day. "Every statement is to be judged by the degree of its suitableness to the distinctive environment of Jesus, on the one hand, and to that of the Gospel-framers at one or another stage in the history of Christianity, on the other. When consistently applied, this test will prove

our safest guide in recovering from the present Gospel records dependable information regarding the life and teaching of the earthly Jesus."[1] It is readily seen from this statement that Case deems everything read into the character and teachings of Jesus in the New Testament to be the product of the fertile thoughts of the disciples after Jesus death had brought them to speculate about his relation to them. Case will accept nothing as belonging to Jesus except those things which can be considered as native to the thinking of that day."For Jesus himself to have made the specific revisions of Jewish messianic thinking that were affected by the disciples, would have been a glaring anachronism."[2] In other words, Jesus thinking must be confined to the thoughts of his age and he must not be able to think anything that the best minds of his day have not thought! Case seems to have made a serious mistake here. He fails to see that the principle he has adopted for measuring the attainments of Jesus would absolutely restrict progress of any kind among men for it is only as now and then some mind towers far above its contemporaries and having grasped a new truth, teaches it to his fellows, that humankind slowly rises to more complete knowledge. Jesus was a man of his age, and undoubtedly was strongly influenced by it, but he also transcended it in a degree unmeasureable. The tendency is to see Jesus in this light.

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson.Jesus,A New Biography.pg.115
2. Ibid.,pg.374

Jesus, man of all ages.

In direct contrast with the thesis of Professor Case which says that Jesus could not concieve any new ideas relevant to Messianic thought we have Bowie's thesis that "in transfiguring moments of his imagination he (Jesus) beheld a new meaning for Messiah."[1] He finds in Jesus' deep spiritual life a source of insight into the true meaning of the nature of God and his plan for men so that Jesus is able to reshape the thinking of his age to conform to the high principle of brotherhood among men under the patronage of a merciful and loving Father. In this understanding Jesus was thinking and revealing truth for all ages. But Bowie is not the only witness to Jesus' transcendent understanding. Barton admits Jesus' relation to the first century and says that " he possessed a first century man's point of view; he would share in some degree a first century man's thoughts."[2] But he shows Jesus' advance over the first century man's viewpoint when he says of Jesus that it "was necessary for him to awaken their messianic expectations, and then gradually lead them to share his more spiritual view of the Kingdom of God."[3] He avows Jesus' universality by the statement that Jesus "is the central figure of the world's history."[4] Kent expresses somewhat the universality and eternity of

1. The Master. pg.68
2. Jesus of Nazareth. pg.124
3. Ibid.,pg.132
4. Ibid.,pg.393

Jesus when he says: "Today also, it is the vivid consciousness of the Christ who abides that gives vital power and efficiency to Christianity."[1] Robinson tells us that: "He had to introduce an entirely new conception of the Messiahship, and this could only be done in the long run by personal contact."[2] "His outlook was a universal one."[3] This independence of Jesus from the first century is well set forth by Walter E. Bundy when he says: "the greatness of Jesus is that he did not coin his fundamental demands into particular precepts. Had he done this he would have anchored his spirit forever in the bedrock of the first century."[4] Bousset finds evidence of Jesus' freedom from the first century when he tells us that "Jesus created the holiest and most lasting symbol that has ever appeared in the history of religion, the Lord's Prayer, in which all who are truly his disciples will ever meet on common ground."[5] "We cannot eliminate from his personality without destroying it, the trait of super-prophetic consciousness, the consciousness of the accomplisher to whose person the flight of the ages and the whole destiny of his followers is linked."[6] He further characterizes him as "Leader of the ages and nations to God,-for death and the grave could not hold his person and his spirit."[7]

1.Kent,Charles,Foster.Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.310
2.St. Mark's Life of Christ.pg.30
3.Ibid.,pg.45
4. Our Recovery of Jesus.pg.193
5. Jesus.pg.114
6. Ibid.,pg.179
7. Ibid.,pg.209

Dr.Harry Emerson Fosdick devotes a section of his meditation on Jesus' Manhood to show that Jesus is at home in every century, a fact for proof of which he appeals to the testimony of human experience.[1] "When you consider that this complete character came out of the first century Palestine, provincial, exclusive, sectarian, how do you estimate Him, holding sixty generations in His spiritual mastership, and making men of twenty centuries feel that when they try to comprehend Him, they were trying to mete out heaven with a span."[2] He sums this up by saying :"All centures, all races, both sexes, all ages, find in the Master their virtues consummated."[3]

Many more similar citations might be quoted to show that these modern biographers are recognizing Jesus' relation to his age and all ages, and the contribution which his age made to his personality and his thinking, but they also insist, for the most part, that he possessed or acquired through sources exclusively personal that something in his genius which has lifted him out of the first century and through all centuries to be in all truth, the Lord of Life.

1. The Manhood of The Master.pg .209
2. Ibid.,pg.155-156
3. Ibid.,pg.159

CHAPTER VII.

THE RELATION OF JESUS TO JUDAISM.

The attempt to confine Jesus within certain limits has found a much more popular endeavor with regard to Jesus' relation to Judaism. Certain types of scholars would have us believe that Jesus never got beyond the confines of the Judaism of his day, while others (the majority) insist with equal fervor that the Judaism of his day could not hold him, nor furnish him with the ideal concepts that underly his life and teaching. The dominant tendency is to find Jesus free from the limits of the Judaistic thought of his day, but there is a well defined effort to picture a Jesus who does not exceed the best of his race. We will examine this group first.

Jesus confined by Judaism.

Here again Professor Case is a leader in the attempt to confine Jesus to the concepts of Judaism. He declares of Jesus: "He was a Hebew of the Hebrews and a Palestinian of the Palestinians. In so far as he refused to conform to current modes of thought and conduct, they suplied an inescapable environment and an immediate stimulus for his own course of action."[1] "On its more formal side, Jesus had inherited his teaching about God from his Hebrew ancestors."[2] A strong second for this point of view is found in Joseph Klausner who takes the position that Jesus is always in his sayings and doings

1. Jesus, A New Biography.pg. 158-159
2. Ibid.,pg.432

an utter Jew.[1] However he weakens a bit when he asserts that although Jesus was a Jew to his dying day, his teaching suggests a break.[2] Others entertain the idea that Jesus was strongly influenced by the closely related Judaism of his day, but refrain from limiting him entirely to its concepts. A trend of this is manifest is the strong eschatological emphasis put by Oscar Holtzmann, Warschauer, Bousset, and others, but that is not our particular interest here. Let us now survey the testimony for Jesus' freedom from Judaism.

Jesus free from the confines of Judaism.

A larger number of scholars among those studied accept the proposition that although Jesus very likely had definite connection with the Judaism of his day, he was by no means dependent upon it nor was he confined by it. We find this matter put very clearly by Dr.Harry Emerson Fosdick when he says that Jesus "was too great to be bound by Jewish exclusiveness."[3] Also when he says:"Consider again how constantly the Master is compelled to stand out against the customs of his people."[4] Robinson tells us that " in His own person He claimed the right to control, and if he saw fit, to supersede the recognized means of grace. What Jesus came into the world to bring was entirely fresh. It could not by any possibility be used in connection with the old forms and the old rites."[5] He gives an example

1.Klausner,Joseph. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.294
2. Ibid.,pg.276
3. The Manhood of The Master.pg.28
4. Ibid.,pg.93
5. St.Mark's Life of Christ.pg.43

of this when he says regarding marriage: "The reply of Jesus (Mark x.1-12) shows that once more he has cut away from all traditional views of the subject."[1] While in Ludwig's account of Jesus' attitude toward the woman of Canaan in Samaria he is obstinate because he is exclusively Jewish in his sympathy,[2] we find in Bosworth's treatment of the same event a rebellion against this interpretation of Jesus' unwillingness t o heal her daughter merely because she was not one of his people.[3] Bosworth holds Jesus to be above such narrow nationalism. It must be remembered that Jesus' purpose in going to this locality was for retirement from public notice. To perform the desired cure would almost certainly precipitate undesired attention upon Jesus and his companions so that he was very loath to do the thing. But his compassion for others was always greater than his thought for himself and he allowed himself to be persuaded to perform the mercy desired. He did, and the very thing he feared happened. He was not able to retire from public notice so that their trip was useless to them. Not only did it bring about public attention but as Bosworth points out , it precipitated the attention of the authorities which would result in their own hurt.[4] Walter E. Bundy avows Jesus' freedom in that "the religious experience of Jesus seeks the recovery and restoration of all mankind."[5] This is directly opposed

1. Robinson, Theodore H. St.Mark's Life of Christ.pg.92
2. The Son of Man.pg.171
3. The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.141
4. Ibid.,pg.212
5. Our Recovery of Jesus.pg.163

to the nationalistic exclusiveness of Judaism. Bowie shows us that Jesus in overcoming the temptations showed his freedom from Judaistic bindings.[1] He phrases his view very graphically when he says that "Jesus wore the livery of no stereotyped ideas."[2] Charles Foster Kent admits that "the evidence is convincing that He singled out and assimilated all that was best in the message of Israel's earlier teachers and made it the basis of his own."[3] However he illustrates Jesus' freedom, and transcendence of Judaism when he tells us that " He gave the term, father, a reality and personal content that made his teaching a new message to men."[4] He gives more examples of this freedom of Jesus', but this is sufficient to show his point of view in the matter. On another approach to the same subject, Georges Berguer, who is telling us about Jesus' superb use of the parable, says that "nothing in Judaism had given him the model for this delightful form."[5] Bousset states his position by writing that "the entire sacred cult of his country contributed nothing to the true core of his pieby."[6] He admits that "while,however, Jesus' preaching was thus based, generally speaking, on the ideas of the Judgement as developed by later Judaism, in one point he goes decidedly beyond them, purifying, illuminating , and exalting them. For he detached the idea of the Kingdom

1. Bowie,Walter,Russel.The Master.pg .87-89
2. Ibid.,pg.235
3. The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.55
4. Ibid.,pg.134
5. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.185
6. Jesus. pg.105

of God from the nation and the national hopes,.."[1]

We clearly see from the evidence presented that the dominant tendency is to present Jesus as independent and transcendent of Judaism.

1. Bousset,Wilhelm. Jesus.pg.123-124

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MISSION OF JESUS.

Upon first consideration, it seems almost impossible to trace here a single dominant tendency in the modern " lives of Jesus", but a closer study reveals the fact that often various authors using different terms to describe the man of our study, have in mind very much the same kind of person. Thus some who call him teacher, or rabbi, have very nearly the same sort of person and work in mind as others who call him prophet or Messiah. True it is that the particular term Messiah has a connotation peculiar to itself, but on the other hand, the conception of Messiahship varies so much, in our own day as well as in Jesus' day, that it is quite possible for one man to call Jesus Messiah and another to call him prophet and mean the same. In fact some call him both.

The matter of terms.

The suggestion above clearly presents the fact that in attempting to name Jesus' mission our chief difficulty arises in the perversion of terms that has taken place over the centuries. It is doubtful if even the best of our critical study can determine for us the exact meanings of the various terms involved here such as prophet, messiah, teacher, etc. There was some confusion in the original use of them. Some called the Baptist a prophet and others did not. Some looked on Jesus as a prophet and there were at least three outstanding conceptions of the meaning of Messiah.

The authorities do not agree as to the meanings of these terms in every case and they are still less united in their application of them to Jesus. However there is no need for this confusion to obstruct our present purpose. It shall be our object to show that there is a general tendency toward similarity in the positions taken upon Jesus' mission. This is discovered through grouping and comparing the conclusions of the various authors under consideration.

The real cause for perplexity.

However distressing the variable terms may make this problem, there is another fact which is the real basis of the perplexity in this problem of defining Jesus' mission. This fact is that in a very true sense he was all of these things and yet was not any one of them to the complete exclusion of the others. Jesus was a healer, and a preacher, and a prophet, and a teacher, and his work makes him somewhat of an originator and a reformer, but who can confine him to any one of these terms? It can only be done by reading into the term selected those qualities and functions that round out the broad character of Jesus, and that is exactly what these authors have done. True, they have read in those qualities and functions which best suited the kind of Jesus they were interested in presenting, or which they felt most truly suited him, but it is only in comparing and studying the meanings of thse terms as used by the various authors under

consideration that we can arrive at a conclusion as to the tendency in this important matter.

The most dominant characterizations given to Jesus are prophet and Messiah, and in such a way as to include all the significant qualities frequently alluded to by the terms teacher, reformer, rabbi, etc. There are exceptions to this of course, which will be noted, but this study is confined to the dominant tendencies.

Jesus as Prophet. The meaning of the term prophet as applied to Jesus by these various authors differs in some respects but in general it means with them one who after the characteristic prophetic type of the Old Testament, proclaimed profound spiritual truth, and as such, revealed the purpose and character of God. This kind of character involves deeply personal religious experience which resulted in strong convictions that shaped the teachings and mission of the one concerned. A prophet, here, is a teacher, but not merely a teacher. He is a revealer of God and his will for men. The prophets usually had some particular message which they attempted to impress upon the people and although this is not so confining a qualification with Jesus as with the earlier prophets, it does apply to Him in that His dominant message was relative to the Kingdom of God. Bosworth reveals this in telling us that the "larger part by far of Jesus' teachings have to do with the nature of the coming Kingdom."[1] He says that "he carried

1. Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.244

the Kingdom with him, as a present fact, and he also looked forward to a future manifestation of the Kingdom,." [1] Walter Bundy also testifies that the "Kingdom of God was t he principal element in Jesus' religious outlook."[2] In presenting Jesus as prophet, the writers mostly avoid the lower traits of that characteristic role. Thus Bundy says:"Jesus was a genuine prophetic personality, the heir of the highest and best in the religious genius of his people, the prince of all the prophets, the culmination of this strange and sensitive strain of religious genius...In one major respect is Jesus untrue to the general character of the prophetic type of religious genius,—in t he psychic phases,visions and ecstasy... In his religious experience we see a practical, if not a complet e eliminat ion of the ecstatic element in prophecy."[3] In this matt er Professor Case concludes the same despite the fact that he has his own conception about Jesus' own contribution to prophetic thought. "Had Jesus been called upon for self-classification in the interests of indicating the type of task to which he had set himself, undoubtedly the word "prophet" would have been the first to spring to his lips."[4] He also explains that "the story of their (the prophets') lives had been familiar to Jesus from early youth and it is not surprising t hat he should have duplicated their

1.Bosworth,E.I.Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.249
2.Our Recovery of Jesu s.pg.47
3.Ibid.,pg.295
4.Jesus,A New Biogr aph y.pg.247

experiences and interpreted his own emotional life in similar fashion."[1] In this connection we must note that Joseph Klausner , who denies Jesus being a prophet,[2] claims that he had a "wish to fulfil some statement in the Old Testament or to imitate some prophet."[3] The teaching element in Jesus' prophetic character is well set forth by Barton who after adopting the attitude that Jesus was not in any sense of the word a technical teacher says of his teaching:"For simple beauty, depth of ethical insight, and practical value in the creation of character, the words of Jesus surpass them all."[4] He speaks for Jesus' relation to the prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah by stating:"Jesus was endowed in unique degree with a sensitive spirit such as enabled the prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah to feel the approach of future events..."[5] Barton speaks of Jesus as 'prophet' with frequent recurrence throughout his book. Oscar Holtzmann concludes that he was looked upon as prophet by the disciples, for he says"Beyond doubt, they (disciples) all reverenced him as they did their great prophets; for, pupular preacher though he was, he could not be grouped with the Scribes."[6] He also characterizes Jesus in his personal ppinion as "this clear thinking prophet."[7] Bousset tells us that "In considering Jesus' mission as a whole it may be best

1.Case,Shirley,Jackson.Jesus,A New Biography.pg.25 3
2. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.267(for example of this see his
3.Ibid.,pg.414 treatment of Jesus imitation
4.Jesus of Nazareth.pg.180of Elijah. Ibid.,pg.294)
5.Ibid.,pg.305
6.The Life of Jesus.pg.322
7.Ibid., pg.434

be called a prophetic one."[1] He explains this by saying ..."we must go back to the great prophets of the Old Testament before we find figures of anything approaching the scale of the Baptist and Jesus. Only with them do we come upon the same power of popular speech, the same dreadful earnestness in the preaching of judgement to come, the same ardour in the struggles against the powers that be and the idle masses, the same insistence upon inwardness and truth in worship, the same grand art of standing alone."[2] The testimony of Charles Foster Kent is to the effect that "Jesus allied himself unequivocally with the prophets."[3] Although Kent regards Jesus primarily as a teacher (though a teacher of the prophetic function) he feels that in the Temple cleansing experience "Jesus appoaches more closely to the role of the ancient Hebrew prophets than at any other time in his ministry. Suddenly the teacher became a social and national reformer."[4] This quotation shows the particular concept that Kent holds with regard to prophecy and thus reveals why he preferred to represent him as a teacher rather than a prophet. His teacher is a revealer of God and his will for men as much as the prophet of other accounts. Ludwig characterizes him as a "prophet of Nazareth,"[5] and frequently speaks of him under a similar caption. Undoubtedly we trace a distinct tendency to regard Jesus' mission as prophetic in these works. But he is also dominantly characterized as Messiah.

1.Bousset,W.Jesus. pg.21 2.Ibid.,pg.22
3.The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.224 4.Ibid.,pg.259
5.The Son of Man.pg.110

Jesus as Messiah.

Undoubtedly Jesus is regarded by most authors under the title of Messiah. But the meaning that the various authors attach to that title differs widely. They can be grouped roughly into two distinct classes. One group of authors have a strong eschatological emphasis and regard Jesus' Messiahship largely with regard to eschatological function. The other group regards Jesus' Messiahship more as the function of Saviourhood which finds the term Messiah the only vehicle at all adequate to convey his significance to the people of his day. It is necessary to trace the tendency to present these two phases of Messiahship seperately.

(1) The eschatological type of Messiah.

By this kind of Messiahship is meant the Messiah of popular expectation, whose mission had more significance in connection with the judgement and the supernatural establishment of the Kingdom than it did with Jesus' moral and spiritual teachings. This position is held by Ludwig. He finds Jesus arriving at the conclusion that he is to fulfil the prophetic utterances concerning the Messiah and be the one who brings the Kingdom in glory after a shameful, sacrificial death, and who is to be their future judge and ruler.[1] The chapter in which he most fully develops this idea, (Chapter V) reveals the fact that Jesus arrives at this conclusion as a result of

1. Ludwig, Emil. The Son of Man. pg.206-207

the influence of popular expectation. He is familiar with his people's hopes and he brings himself to the place where he actually believes he is the Messiah. Ludwig does not stand alone in this conclusion. We find Oscar Holtzmann presenting a similar view. He tells us that Jesus believes "that he himself will acctually appear as judge at that judgement."[1](in the last day).. "And after the judgement he will be God's vice-gerent on earth, the king in the eternal kingdom which belongs to the saints of the most high."[1] He strengthens this stand by insisting that "the starting point of Jesus' preaching is therefore to be found in its eschatology: 'The end of the existing world is immediately at hand, therefore repent ye'."[2] And adds:"..we must regard the eschatological discourses in the preaching of Jesus as being (to use a metaphor) not merely accidental offshoots, but the roots which support the trunk of the tree."[2] This conception is supported by Joseph Klausner. It must be noted that as a Jew, Klausner does not consider Jesus to have been the hoped for Messiah in any sense whatever, but he does allow, and asserts, that Jesus himself had apocalyptic messianic hopes and also developed a personal messianic consciousness. This conception which he allows Jesus to have held as a personal concern involved an actual new creation coming in glory and his subsequent enthronement.[3]

1. The Life of Jesus. pg.138
2. Ibid.,pg.160(note 1)
3. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.283

However he also insists that Jesus could not have believed in a crucified Messiah. Rather he hoped to come through his suffering to triumph before actual death.[1] Case here takes a kind of mid-way position. He holds to Jesus' eschatological beliefs, and characterizes him as "an eschatologist, not a messianist;"[2] but he tells us that "the supreme need of the hour was to summon the Jewish people to a life more in perfect accord with the will of God. Without reserve Jesus now gave himself to the pursuit of this new-found prophetic task."[3] This idea of Jesus' task is more in accord with what is here(in this study) called the "Saviour type" of Messiah. However Case can hardly be considered an advocate of this view when he has already told us "Jesus believed the judgement to be at hand, and was impelled by this conviction to take up the preaching of repentance,..."[4] Bosworth also has this double conception, but like Case, he definitely has Jesus looking for a future, sudden, and glorious consumation of the age, resulting in the establishment of the new Kingdom, regardless of the present uncataclysmic manifestation, which is a sort of preparation for the more spectacular event.[5] Robinson professes to reject a strong eschatological interpretation of Jesus,[6] and insists that the

1. Klausner, Joseph. Jesus of Nazareth.pg.283
2. Jesus, A New Biography.pg.427
3. Ibid.,pg.264
4. Ibid.,pg.244
5. The Life and Teaching of Jesus.pg.244-249
6. St.Mark's Life of Christ.pg.79

traditional views did not sum up all that Jesus felt about his own Messiahship.[1] However he has Jesus completely engrossed in fulfilling the prophecies at the latter end of his life, and in throwing his life away in expectation of his Kingdom coming by miraculous means, so that it seems necessary to class him among this group of biographers of Jesus.[2]

(2) The Saviour type of Messiah. The other tendency in portraying the Messiahship of Jesus is here called the 'Saviour type.' This group feels that Jesus adopted the Messianic figure as the best representation of what he was, but that it was too inadequate to properly express his real mission so that Jesus had to reinterpret the term according to his own knowledge of God's will. This conception is the most dominant one among the works considered in this study of modern Lives of Jesus. We find the idea put very well by Berguer when he says: "It matters little whether people give him the name or not, or whether he is the Messiah in the historical sense; he is to be a Messiah in the sense of moral truth and the Spirit, that is in the divine human sense."[3] Berguer agrees with Bousset that the Messianic term was accepted by Jesus but that it was quite inadequate. "Thus the idea of the Messiah was for Jesus the only possible form of consciousness, and yet an incomplete form, a necessity, and a heavy yoke as well, under

1. Robinson.T.H. St.Mark's Life of Christ.pg.82
2. Ibid.,pg.96,112
3. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.179

which he walked silently almost to the end of his life; a testimony giving to him the inward secret of his being, which at the same time, surrounded him with insoluble external difficulties."[1] This is also the idea of Warschauer who says of the Messianic idea:.."the apparent impossibility of reconciling the consciousness of His Sonship with what appeared to be the only admissible interpretation of that consciousness, viz. as pointing to Himself as the Messiah."[2] The expression of this changed idea of Messiahship is well put by Walter Russel Bowie:"He saw the way in which the deliverance his world was seeking for must come, if it came at all. In transfigured moments of his imagination he beheld a new meaning for Messiah. And in that mystery of his soul's awareness into which no analysis can follow, he felt himself to be God's chosen Son through whom the message of the Highest should be expressed."[3] This he later interprets more explicitly when he says: "When he took the title of "the Son of Man", he took it because in the tremendous poetry of his spiritual transvaluation he would make that name suggest a Messiahship which brought God's deliverance already into the midst of human life."[4] Harry Emerson Fosdick puts this mission of Jesus forcibly:"the passion of his (Jesus) life was Saviourhood."[5] He speaks of Jesus'

1. Berguer,Georges.Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.pg.241 (cf.Wilhelm Bousset."Jesus" pg.175)
2.Warschauer,J.The Historical Life of Christ.pg.54
3.The Master.pg.68-69.
4. Ibid.,pg.117
5. The Manhood of the Master. pg.126

acceptance of the title of Messiah in direct relation to Jesus' consciousness of his being the only one who thoroughly knows God,[1] thus showing that the concept served to give a vehicle to present God to mankind. A very clear presentation of this type of Messiahship as Jesus' interpretation of it is set forth by George A. Barton. He tells us that "as at his baptism the consciousness of his messianic mission dawned upon his mind, so now there opened to his consciousness a clearer view than he had before had of the function of his person in making men understand what God is like, and in drawing men to God."[2] The idea is graphically made real by Charles Foster Kent who draws the picture of Jesus the carpenter and builder as a builder of men. "Thus the Master Builder, by study, by meditation, and practical experience, was trained in God's own way to become the Master Builder of men. Moreover he was able to train those who in turn became builders of men so skillfully that through them his influence has gone thorughout all the world."[3] In considering John's inquiry about his Messiahship, Kent imagines Jesus as saying: "I am not the Messiah of the popular expectation, but I am doing the work of Jehovah's servant as defined by his most spiritual prophet."[4] Kent moreover emphatically denies that Jesus indicated his possibility of becoming

1. Fosdick, Harry, Emerson. The Manhood of the Master. pg. 142
2. Jesus of Nazareth. pg. 259
3. The Life and Teaching of Jesus. pg. 56
4. Ibid., pg. 72

the Messianic King of Isreal's hope. "His unassuming action, however, on reaching the Temple, while absolutely consistent with his own character, forever disproved the conclusion still held by many that he hoped at this time to establish himself on the throne of David as Israel's long-awaited messianic king."[1] He expresses Jesus' messianic ideal as one "who should do the will of God by humble, tireless service, even though the path of service led to the cross."[2] He was able to perform his saving work because he himself had felt many of the same needs and had found the only way of satisfying them."[3]

Thus we see the ideas set forth by this group of scholars who look upon Jesus as a Saviour and as a revealer of God's will for men through his life and teachings rather than as one destined to become a supernatural figure as suggested by the Messianic prophecies and eschatological hopes of Judaism. All admit that it is impossible to remove eschatology from the teachings of Jesus entirely, but these men find it is merely a means to an end rather than an end in itself. It was never the distinctive or the important thing with Jesus.

1.Kent.C.F.The Life and Teachings of Jesus.pg.257
2. Ibid.,pg.273
3. Ibid.,pg.320

CHAPTER IX.

SUMMARY

In the preceeding pages has been presented a study of the tendencies dominant in presenting the life of Jesus as it has been written by a group of serious modern authors. The discussion has been confined strictly to this problem and no attempt to evaluate the various works considered has been made. The study has been based upon a representative group of authors from as wide a variety of viewpoints as possible within the limits of the study.

We have discovered that these authors are unanimous in presenting Jesus as an actual historical person, and the detailed bases of three special works on Jesus' historicity are summarized to establish this fact.

It has also been shown that there is a tendency to present Jesus as a man of supreme character, dauntless in courage and transcending all men in merciful love and compassion. His moral character is presented as unimpeachable, and the basis for the whole is found to be largely in Jesus' prayer-life which is his primary medium of perfect communion with his Father in Heaven.

These writers have given us a Jesus who is entirely human in the physical sense; of human birth, of normal growth, and of a physically normal and natural youth and manhood. However they make particular effort to

reveal that Jesus is by no means an ordinary human but is one that has never been equaled, either before or since his time. Jesus was the complete normal man.

Jesus' life has been presented by the works reviewed as non-miraculous in the supernatural connotation of that term. His birth is found to be normal, his temptation experience has been shown to be entirely within the bounds of the physical laws of the universe as are Jesus' wonderful deeds, which are mostly acredited as valid. His resurrection is likewise judged to be non-miraculous. Some do not attempt to solve it while others classify it as purely spiritual in nature, but none maintains a physical resurrection.

Some of these authors have judged Jesus to be entirely the product of his age but the dominant tone has presented him as closely related to and influenced by his age, but transcending its restrictions.

The same situation exists with relation to Jesus' connection with the Judaism of his day. Some find him entirely the product of his heritage while the larger group find Jesus transcending by far the greatest that Israel ever attained, or that any other has since or before achieved among all mankind.

The presentation of Jesus' mission has been somewhat made vague and seemingly contradictory because of the indefinite meanings connected with the terms used to classify Jesus, and because of his all-inclusive

personality. However a close study reveals two figures to be the dominant modes of presentation: namely those of prophet and Messiah. The Messianic presentation of Jesus has split along two lines. These are the eschatological type and the Saviour type.The eschatological type emphasizes the supernatural coming of the Kingdom, and the Saviour Type presents a Messiah who brings men the Kingdom by revealing to them the will and nature of God and shows them how to obtain union with him through a perfection and glorification of man's common way of life, lived in a supreme and God-willed way, even as He had done.

****

* Now have the homely things been made
Sacred, and a glory on them laid.
For He whose shelter was a stall,
The King, was born among them all.
He came to handle saw and plane,
To use and hallow the profane:
Now is the holy not afar
In temples lighted by a star,
But where the loves and labors are.
Now that the King has gone this way,
Great are the things of every day!

Finis.

---

*From "The Consecration of the Common Way" by Edwin Markham.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Bacon, Benjamin, Wisner. Jesus the Son of God.(152pg.) New York; Henry Holt and Company,1930.

Berguer,Georges. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus. (332pg.)..Translation by Elanor Stimson Brooks and Van Wyck Brooks...New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1923.

Bosworth, Edward Increase. The Life and Teachings of Jesus.(424pg.)New York: Macmillan Company,1926.

Bousset,Wilhelm.Jesus.(211pg.)New York: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1906.

Bowie, Walter,Russel. The Master.(328pg.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Bundy, Walter, E. Our Recovery of Jesus.(493pg.) Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1929.

Case, Shirley, Jackson. Jesus, A New Biography.(453pg.) Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1927.

*Case,Shirley, Jackson. The Historicity of Jesus.(352pg.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1912.

Fosdick, Harry, Emerson. The Manhood of the Master. (159pg.) 11th ed. London: Student Christian Movement, 1918.

Headlam, Arthur, C. The Life and Teachings of Jesus the Christ.(336pg.) New York: Oxford Univeristy Press,1923.

Holtzmann,Oscar. The Life of Jesus.(542pg.) London: ..Translated by J.T.Bealby and Maurice A. Vanney... 1901 (Leben Jesu) Adam and Charles Black, 1904

*The first two thirds of this book was thoroughly read and the remaining pages omitted as irrelevant.All of the other works on this page have been thoroughly read.

Kent, Charles,Foster. The Life and Teachings of Jesus. (337pg.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Klausner, Joseph. Jesus of Nazareth.(434pg.)..... Translated from the original Hebrew by Herbert Danby... New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Ludwig, Emil. The Son of Man.(319pg.)(Der Menschensohn , Geschichte eines Propheten)....Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul...New York: Boni & Liveright, 1928.

Robinson, Theodore, H. St.Mark's Life of Christ.(134pg.) London: Student Christian Movement, 1922.

*Scott, Ernest, Findlay. The Gospel and its Tributaries. (295pg.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Warschauer, J. The Historical Life of Christ.(368pg.) New York: Macmillan Company, 1927.

Worcester, Elwood. Was Jesus an Historical Person.(79pg.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1926.

---

*This book was used for historical study only and was thoroughly read through pages 1-100, and 132-155.All of the other works here listed have been thoroughly studied throughout the entire text.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02574 1853